

# MEMO

---

**TO:** Bill Wiley, AICP  
**FROM:** Greg A. Beliveau, AICP   
**DATE:** March 29, 2010  
**SUBJECT:** Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendments – 2006, 2007, 2008, and Cycles in 2010

---

The City of Leesburg has several Large Scale Comprehensive Plan applications currently in limbo from the years 2005 to 2008 which need direction toward resolution. The applications can be divided into two groups based on location, proximity to infrastructure, potential for sprawl issue and other evaluation criteria DCA utilizes upon review. Below are the two groups and the list of applicants involved:

## **Group One – Located north of CR 48/470**

- Deems (06-147)
- Woodrell (07-49)
- Musso-Spence (07-50)
- Teeter (07-52)
- Lafayette Square (07-53)
- Lake Commander Park (07-54)
- Hawthorne (08-05)
- PEAR Park (included due to lack of impact)

The dwelling unit impacts are a total of 828 units; three are commercial, industrial or institutional and a fourth is mostly commercial. We can argue for infill regarding the majority of these applications. The impacts to water and waste water are minimal.

## **Group Two – Located south of CR 470 and east along CR 48**

- Triangle Lakes (06-138)
- Benderson (Smoak) (06-139)
- Carter-Norman (06-141)
- Hunt (07-59)
- Banning Ranch (07-60)
- Aguia Marina (07-61)
- Battaglia (07-62)
- Renaissance Trails (07-63)
- Merritt (07-64)
- Janney (07-65)
- McElyea/Knowles (07-96)
- Bouis (08-02)

- Zellwood (08-28)
- Renaissance Estates (08-45)

These sites are located in an area that DCA stated needs “Visioning” (\$37,500  $\pm$ ) which the City should provide to determine future development patterns, trends, utility needs, character and ability to pay for infrastructure. This is the area that DCA previously identified need and sprawl as issues and recommended the visioning as the main method to address these issues and to introduce mix uses (possibly more than one category) to create urban centers. These applications as originally submitted asked for several thousands of residential units (13,719 du) which would negatively impact the City’s water capacity. A possible solution to this potential problem would be policy specific amendments for several of the applicants which would drop the unit count to 7,479 units – about half for the 14 sites.

Therefore, the choices for the City to consider are:

- A. Move forward with Group One
- B. Move forward with Groups One and Two with Visioning
- C. Move forward with Groups One and Two with Visioning and modify Group Two’s unit request

The obvious cost and time associated with each option escalates; Option A is the least expensive and most timely due to less issues (6-8 months) (\$45,000 – \$60,000  $\pm$ ); Option C is the second in cost and time since unit counts and utility impacts are reduced from original request (8-12 months) (\$37,500 + \$65,000 - \$80,000  $\pm$ ); Option B is the most difficult, costly, and time consuming (12+ months) (\$37,500 + \$80,000 - \$95,000  $\pm$ ).